



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/353,160	07/14/1999	MARKKU KORPI	99P7704US	3063

7590 10/06/2003

SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
186 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

ABELSON, RONALD B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2666	9

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/353,160	KORPI ET AL.
	Examiner Ronald Abelson	Art Unit 2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 17-21 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,5,6,8,11-13 and 15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 2-4,7,9,10,14 and 16 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 3 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims must end with a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 11-13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins (US 6,496,477) in view of Kanter (WO 98/59470).

Regarding claims 1, 6, and 11, the system comprises a H.323 controller (fig. 1 box 151, col. 20 line 64) configured to handle call and control signaling during a media communication with another H.323 endpoint (fig. 8 box 817).

The H.323 controller provides a communication domain identifier for address resolution during a media communication (Proxy Identifier, network region, fig. 19 box 1941, col. 30 lines 5-14),

Although Perkins teaches a communication domain identifier to identify network domains and a server, the inventor is silent on gatekeepers within the network domain and the network domain being a virtual domain.

Kanter teaches, in a H.323 environment, a gatekeeper (fig. 1 box 11) connected to a server (fig. 1 box 9) within a virtual domain (fig. 1 box 7, pg. 3 lines 4-10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both Perkins and Kanter before him/her and with the teachings [a] as shown by Perkins, a H.323 controller configured to handle call and control signaling during a media communication with another H.323 endpoint; the H.323 controller providing a communication domain identifier for address resolution during a media communication, and [b] as shown by Kanter, in a H.323 environment, a gatekeeper connected to a server within a virtual domain, to be motivated to modify the system of Perkins by replacing the domains containing Proxy A,B (fig. 8) with virtual domain as taught by Kanter (fig.

Art Unit: 2666

1). This would improve the system since gatekeepers provide security from non registered users accessing the system. In addition, virtual domains allow more efficient use of network resources than permanent domains since the connections to the virtual domains remain for only the time period when the domain is active.

Regarding claims 6 and 13, in addition to the limitations listed, a database (fig. 8 element 815, col. 19 lines 14-19).

Regarding claim 11, in the system described above by the combination of Perkins and Kanter, the packet switch network (Perkins: H.323, fig. 8, col. 20 line 64), a plurality of endpoints coupled to the packet switched network (Kanter: fig. 1, interfaces connecting the VPN (box 7) with the outside), a gatekeeper coupled to the packet switched network (Kanter: fig. 1, box 11), wherein predetermined numbers of the plurality of endpoints define virtual domains associated with a same gatekeeper or virtual domains associated with multiple gatekeepers (Kanter: pg. 3 lines 4-10).

Regarding claim 5, the H.323 endpoint comprises a client terminal or gateway (Perkins: fig. 8 box 813, col. 19 lines 13-15).

Regarding claims 12 and 15, the endpoints include CDI controllers for resolving associated virtual domains during call setup (RSVP, col. 4 line 42)

Regarding claim 8, the controller (Perkins: fig. 8 box 813) is configured to access the database (Perkins: fig. 8 element 815) for a virtual domain identifier in a direct signaling mode. See spec, in direct signaling the database is local (applicant: pg. 2 lines 8-10).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 17-21 are allowed.

5. Claims 2-4, 7, 9, 10, 14, and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following are statements of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Regarding claims 2 and 17, nothing in the prior art of the record teaches or fairly suggests the controller determines a domain of a called party.

Regarding claims 3, 7, 14, nothing in the prior art of the record teaches or fairly suggests the controller provides the gatekeeper with the CDI. In contrast, the controller provides the network with a request that the CDI be provided to the source terminal.

Regarding claims 4, 9, and 16, nothing in the prior art of the record teaches or fairly suggests the CDI is used to determine a domain during execution of domain-restricted functions, in combination with all the other limitations listed in the claim.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to

Art Unit: 2666

Ronald Abelson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5622.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (703) 308-5463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Rao
Ronald Abelson
Examiner
Art Unit 2666



DANGTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER